UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

What Will Japan Do Now? - *Walter B. Bullen*

1942—Utopia Triumphant—An Introduction to a Friendly World of Garden Cities - - - - - - *David Jobman*

Parties and the Democratic Principles - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Trumpets on New Horizons

Edited by Lucia Trent and Ralph Cheyney

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 7

Chicago, September, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
- Editorial Comment—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 107
- Editorial—CURTIS W. REESE 110

ARTICLES—
- What Will Japan Do Now?—WALTER B. BULLEN 111
- 1942—Utopia Triumphant—An Introduction to a Friendly World of Garden Cities—DAVID JOBMAN 113
- Parties and the Democratic Principles—VICTOR S. YARROS 116

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
- Freedom—EUGENE GINSBERG 115
- Surplus—MILDRED GOFF 115
- Death and Life—CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS 115
- Poetry Speaks—MYRTLE BELLE WARD 115
- The Greater Thanksgiving—THOMAS BRUCE REESE 115

THE STUDY TABLE—
- The Great Hatred—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 117
- Raising the Power of Prayer—RALPH CHEYNEY 118

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Congratulations!—OLIVE COLE SMITH 119
- More Power to Mr. Holmes—MAY STRANATHAN 119
- Reply to Mr. Jobman—FLORA WHITE 119
- Slightly Saddened—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 120
- A Deserved Tribute—ALFRED STIERNOTTE 120
- The Right to Strike—F. S. KINDER 120

THE FIELD—
- The Mechanism for World Peace—League for World Federation 106

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Mechanism for World Peace

The recent statement by acting Secretary of State Welles is attracting attention, that peace terms by the warring states must provide a rigid form of international supervision of war armaments. This opens up by the Administration a subject which has been kept in the background. Of course it some day had to come to the public.

The only feasible mechanism for international supervision of war armaments, as history shows, is the American Federal State, a complete success. Forty-eight states are federated and all issues are justiciable.

Therefore the only feasible mechanism for international supervision of war armaments on a world-wide scale is to extend our wonder-working Federal State as follows:

The Federation of the Western Hemisphere.

The Federation of the Eastern Hemisphere.

The Federation of Australasia, including the Philippines.

World Federation of the three regional federations, to become the World State.

Each of these three regional federations should possess its international government, to be placed in charge of the trade between the said Regional Federations, *so that Germany shall not get a foothold on our Western Hemisphere, nor in Australasia; nor Japan get a foothold in Australasia, including the Philippines.*

But that Germany, Italy, and Japan shall each be offered an equality with the other individual States *as to international trade.* They have been at a disadvantage during the past decades among sovereign states and competition in war armament. That is, Great Britain and the United States by the combined use of their navies have been dominating the seven seas and thereby have maintained access to raw materials in connection with their colonies, as slave countries, and thus have attained an unequal advantage, accentuated by the forced treaties of conquest in 1919, but which in the change in earth's condition to a New Age of Progress for the masses, has given rise to today's second World War.

This needed equality in today's new age can now be achieved because of today's stupendous disadvantages to Great Britain and the United States from their competition in war implements and fighting with Germany. In other words, our United States by offering to cooperate in World Federation can participate in the needed organization for the ending of militarism and its wars—the coming of perpetual world peace and justice between competing states.

The practicability is beyond a shadow of doubt.

—LEAGUE FOR WORLD FEDERATION.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII SEPTEMBER, 1941 No. 7

Editorial Comment

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

How history does repeat itself! The meeting of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill was as dramatic as the meeting of Napoleon and Tsar Alexander on the raft at Tilsit, and as romantic as the meeting of Henry VIII and Francis I on the famous Field of the Cloth of Gold. As for the outcome of the meeting, the Joint Declaration, it was of course instantly reminiscent of Woodrow Wilson's ill-fated Fourteen Points. Are these Eights Points, as put forth by the American President and the English Premier, destined to any better fate? Of course, in one regard and this is the most important, the Eight Points have an enormous advantage over the Fourteen, in that they are the official pronouncement of the official heads of the two great nations represented, whereas the latter were the mere unofficial and personal statement of Wilson's aspirations. Just where Roosevelt and Churchill got the power thus to commit their governments without any authorization of or even consultation with Congress and Parliament, is an interesting but wholly academic question. We are getting used, these days, to one-man rule! But the fact remains that, thanks to the exercise of this power, the Joint Declaration has a standing altogether superior to that ever held by the Wilson statement. As to the content of the Declaration, it contains promises, or rather hopes, as noble as any contained in the Fourteen Points. The economic planks are especially admirable. But what does "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"—what does this mean as applied, for example, to Russia and India? And "sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them"—does this mean the British colonies as well as the German conquests? And if not, why not? The reference to "freedom from fear and want" is something of a shock. What has become of the other two of the famous four Rooseveltian freedoms—worship and expression? Were these waived in deference to Russia? But what is more important than all such criticisms is the fact that this whole Declaration is in effect a new declaration of war against Germany. So far as the present crisis is concerned, it means war and not peace. Nothing is to be done until "after the final destruction of Nazi tyranny." This means a long, long war, fought through at awful cost to victory. At the end, Germany is to be disarmed, and the Allies, themselves still armed to the teeth, are to take charge of Europe. This is precisely Versailles all over again. Not "a peace without victory," not a negotiated peace, but a dictated peace. History does indeed repeat itself!

II

But there is one statement in this Declaration which needs to be rescued from all criticism whatsoever. It is the Eighth Point, which reads in its opening sentence:

> *They [the signatories] believe that all the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force.*

One rubs his eyes as he reads this statement, especially as coming from the two leading world statesmen of our day. "The abandonment of the use of force!" Why, that is pacifism—the very principle that pacifists have been urging from the time of Jeremiah and Jesus to the present time of Tolstoi and Gandhi. You can't get rid of war, we pacifists have said, until you get rid of force and "the use of force." And here are President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill agreeing with us! It is true that, in the habit of statesmen, this categorical statement is immediately hedged about by reservations to the effect that only "nations which threaten, or may theaten, aggression outside of their frontiers" are to be disarmed. For other nations, as for the world at large, there is going to be an attempt not to abolish but only to "lighten . . . the crushing burden of armaments." But, for the moment at least, this is not important. What thrills me, and convinces me that this Atlantic conference was as important as it was romantic, is this flat fact that the pacifist doctrine —the whole sum and substance of what has been, and is today still being, denounced as silly utopianism when

it is not actually treason—is here laid down by the official spokemen of the two greatest governments of the world as the end and aim of all their endeavors. This is an event to match the Paris Pact which, as the climax and fulfillment of S. O. Levinson's long campaign, outlawed war as an instrument of national policy. It is true that the outlawry of war did not end war—but only because the nations refused to obey their own mandate! It is true that this declaration of a belief in "the abandonment of the use of force" may not end force—but if so, it will be because the nations choose to fight. Nonetheless, the principle is here proclaimed. Pacifism stands vindicated anew. Henceforth, beloved friends, when we are denounced and ridiculed, treated with all manner of contumely and contempt, ignored as foolish and ousted as dangerous, we can quietly reply, "We believe what Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston S. Churchill say they believe—'the abandonment of the use of force.'"

III

Some impressions of the passing scene of war! Germany is releasing pictures of the Russian war, which are being published in our American newspapers. The pictures show burning towns and villages, wasted harvest fields, broken bridges, refugees, prisoners, dead bodies. And this is the German idea of propaganda favorable to their cause! * * * A few weeks ago *Life* published pictures of the nine Soviet leaders who now rule Russia under Stalin's direction. If these are the thugs who are to save our world from barbarism, then may God help us all! * * * The principal export of Great Britain to this country is whiskey. In return for this "booze" we send to Britain arms, ammunition, bombing planes and tanks. This is what is called civilization! * * * The United States, in retaliation for Japan's invasion of Indo-China, has "frozen" the Japanese silk trade in this country. American hosiery factories are closing, and thousands of employees are being thrown out of work. This is called defending America! * * * Word is being passed around from Washington to the newspapers that it will be just as well if the word, "Red," is no longer used in connection with Russian armies, Russian statesmen, etc. The word awakens embarrassing memories, and hurts morale in this war. * * * Lloyd's, of London, has announced that it is willing to take odds of 1000 to 1 that Washington or any other American city will not be bombed by the Nazis. Yet the nonsense of bomb shelters, fire wardens, and general civilian defense for our cities still continues. * * * Tolstoi's famous son, long a resident of this country, is quoted in the New York *Times* (July 29th last) as differentiating between "black hatred which sears the soul" and "bright sacred hatred which unifies and uplifts." His father, a simple soul, never discovered this distinction. * * * A special Washington dispatch in the Newark *Evening News* describes the "thousands of refugees created within the United States" by the war—"suddenly homeless families driven away from their ruined dwellings, wondering where they can make a new start. These are the share croppers and tenant farmers whose lands have been incorporated in army camp sites." The Farm Security Administration is trying to "rescue the situation from chaos." This also is called defending America. * * * *Peace Action,* the monthly bulletin published by the National Council for Prevention of War, under the editorship of Frederick J. Libby, is calling for the retirement of Secretaries Stimson and Knox. "The growing demand for the removal of these two Cabinet members," writes Dr. Libby, may be met in either one of two ways—by removal or by impeachment. * * * Gallup and other polls show that public sentiment against entering the war has risen in recent weeks, and now stands as high as 70 to 80 per cent. New York State votes 70.5 per cent against war, and Illinois 80.7 per cent.

IV

The summer (July) issue of the *War Resister,* published in Enfield, England, has come to hand, and brings heartening news of the vitality of the pacifist movement the world around. In GREAT BRITAIN the movement is still at the peak of its power and influence. The Peace Pledge Union, which reached its highest membership in 1940, when it numbered 137,477, has suffered only a slight reduction to 135,134. Latest available figures show a total of 440 active anti-war groups busily at work. * * * In AUSTRALIA, the pacifist paper, the *Peacemaker,* suspended for a time by the government, has resumed publication and is widely distributed. * * * In NEW ZEALAND, no less than 43 per cent of those called up for military service under the Conscription Act appealed on various grounds. Among those drawn in the first two ballots for territorial service, there were 407 conscientious objectors; and for overseas service, 513 conscientious objectors. * * * In INDIA, Gandhi and the All-India Congress continue to oppose the war, and at least 15,000 arrests have been made by the government for "political offences," mostly in connection with anti-war activities. * * * In DENMARK, the Danish section of the War Resisters International is continuing to publish its paper, *Aldrig Mere Krieg* (No More War) without interruption. Meetings are being held throughout the country in collaboration with such organizations as the Danish Peace and League of Nations Union and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Also, a series of study circles has been held in Copenhagen under the general title of "War's Problems." In their latest publication the peace-workers write, "The Danish movement lives and works and prepares itself for the new day." * * * From NORWAY have come reassuring messages from pacifists in various parts of the country, one with the significant phrase, "We are still in busi-

ness." * * * From HOLLAND also come reassuring messages. * * * In FINLAND there were numerous conscientious objectors in the Russo-Finnish war, most of them (peasants with religious convictions) objecting only to bearing arms. A small number of "absolutists" were interned and suffered hardships. The pacifist paper, *Frid pa Jorden,* was being published at last accounts. All this is cheering news. In this latest "holy war," the pacifist movement is stronger than ever, and on both sides of the battle front stands undaunted. Who of us would be discouraged in the face of such news? If this country goes to war, shall we not resolve to write the same heroic record?

V

I have been reading two books—Martin Du Garde's great Nobel Prize novel, *The Thibaults,* and William B. Shirer's extraordinary account of wartime Germany, *Berlin Diary*. The combination was fatal to the novel. In the intense and realistic light of Shirer's book, how garish, grotesque, and downright silly appeared Du Garde's masterpiece. Is it possible that a man could sit down and write these more than 800 pages about family discords, hectic love affairs, and personal griefs and gratifications, and expect anybody to take them seriously? What kind of people were these who could writhe and weep over little private concerns of no more interest and importance than a fly's buzzing busyness upon a window pane? Yet there was a time when this was the kind of world in which we had our abode, and the kind of lives we lived—a time before the earth cracked as in the throes of earthquake and the heavens rolled together as a flaming scroll. It is these latter days of cataclysm of which Shirer writes, with a vividness and power which are overwhelming. As we read his exciting pages, with their grim picture of what has gone and their grimmer portent of what is yet to come, can any one of us be troubled again by trivial personal affairs? Shall we be Thibaults to moan because love is unrequited, or to worry because hopes are vain? It is hard to think of such a world and such people. Nor is it necessary. For this world is now gone, and in our time will not return. Romain Rolland, in his *Jean Christophe,* saw this with a clarity of vision and an intensity of feeling which makes his novel one of the epic masterpieces of all time. *The Thibaults* is not in the same class at all. Yet in its sheer triviality, as seen against the background of Shirer's book, it measures as nothing else can measure the change which has come upon our age. This is one consolation for our experience, at least—that, whatever the agony of our hearts and the tragedy of our world, if we live at all, it must be in "the measure of the stature of the fullness" of an age of cosmic consequence. We must live greatly, in other words, as the mere condition of survival. The Thibaults, with all their petty ideas and interests, are no more—thank God!

VI

RABINDRANATH TAGORE (the SIR is not used, as he returned his knighthood to the English crown contemptuously years ago!) was one of the three great men of India in our time. With Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, he constituted a trinity unequalled for genius and leadership by any other nation of the world. I saw and heard him many times, and twice met him for intimate personal talks—and always he impressed me as one of the few men I have seen and known whose very presence was the sign and seal of their greatness. He was in stature, mien, and facial appearance a veritable king—the seer and poet to the life. His writings, long since crowned by the Nobel Prize for Literature, have an immortal place in the library of the world's best writings. In masterpieces such as *Gitanjali,* he matched a profound mystic sensibility with a serene simplicity of expression (both in his original tongue and in his English translation), and therewith attained an altogether unique and remarkable combination of wisdom and beauty. And in his *Crescent Moon* and certain dramatic pieces, he wrote for children as few men have ever written. In India, if not so much in the rest of the world, he was reverenced not only as an author but as a teacher. Convinced that education, apart from all English influence, could alone produce true leaders of the Indian people and preserve the native culture of the country, Tagore founded and maintained a notable school to which students flocked and which was a Mecca of visitation for all intelligent foreign travelers. In the great movement for national independence, Rabindranath Tagore was an outstanding leader. Not agreeing in all things with Gandhi, he recognized the Mahatma's supreme genius, and supported his non-cooperation campaign for freedom. The difference between the two men is striking. Gandhi is as insignificant looking as Tagore was regal. Gandhi has little of that sense of beauty which was central to Tagore's soul. Grandhi practises an asceticism which Tagore neither understood nor altogether sympathized with. But the two men were one in their devotion to India, in their abhorrence of British rule, and in their insistence upon liberty. Tagore was of course a pacifist and internationalist as the mystic must ever be. War could have no place in his system either of thought or life. His lament over the World War of 1914-18 is an unforgettable prophecy of the spirit.

Correction

In the August issue, UNITY published an oration by Ralph Westlake, allegedly delivered at the funeral of Miss Lydia G. Wentworth. We have received information to the effect that, as Mark Twain might have said, "this oration was greatly exaggerated." Miss Wentworth, longtime friend of UNITY, is living.

EDITORIAL

CURTIS W. REESE

Already we in America are beginning to reap some of the natural consequences of our over-emphasis on national defense in our earlier campaign for an increase in the armed forces. Perhaps this over-emphasis was necessary, since we are as yet a provincial people; nevertheless it is natural for a reaction to set in. Most people cannot yet envisage bombs dropping on the eastern seaboard, much less in the Mississippi valley. What we need to learn is that even if American democracy could survive in an anti-democratic world, it would be a miserable existence in which the ghosts of dead democracies from across the seas would haunt us by night and in which fear would terrorize us by day. Suppose the whole western hemisphere could survive an Axis-controlled Europe, Asia, and Africa, have we no concern for the Britain that is and the France that was? Have we no responsibility for the Chinese Republic that was born of our loins? Is the Russian experiment of no concern to us? Our statesmen, our educators, and our propagandists should lift the discussion of international affairs above the level of mere national defense. We need a vision of a world wherein the four freedoms ring, and we need to be told plainly of our responsibility for the building and the maintenance of such a world. Americans who do not respond to the defense of New York, Omaha, and points west will respond to the defense of the decencies of civilization and to the challenge of a new world. It is high time that we learn that liberty and equality and cooperation cannot be effectively built in a single nation. The world is one, and some way must be found to bring this fact home to all the people. No nation liveth unto itself alone.

Liberals in America have had a shocking but effective awakening. For a quarter of a century they had been gradually growing doubtful of the value of the liberal temper and spirit. They had seen new and strange systems come into being in other parts of the world, with power to do quickly many of the things that liberal democracy seemed impotent to accomplish. They grew skeptical of liberty as an end; and they became sure of its ineffectiveness as a means. Some became dogmatic believers in the new orders that were springing up elsewhere; others simply wilted and fell by the wayside. A few, while remaining faithful in thought, fearfully awaited the impending doom. Futilitarianism grew rampant. But in course of time there came from foreign shores disquieting stories of how all was not well in the lands of the new orders. The things for which they had sacrificed liberty had not materialized. Goods were not plentiful and security was a myth. Militarism had gone wild, and tyranny had become commonplace. The ordinary virtues were abandoned, and fear stalked abroad. There was no hope in systems not founded on liberty. So it was that American liberals, with a start and with much rubbing of the eyes, again saw that the long road of liberty is still the shortest road to any worthwhile social order. It remains to be seen, however, whether re-awakened liberals will repeat the mistakes of the past. They should understand that liberty does not subsist in general; but that it exists in specifics. Liberty is not a disembodied spirit; it requires bone and sinew. Food, shelter, and clothing; schools, churches, and art galleries; granaries, arsenals, and dynamos;—all these and more are the substance of liberty. Freedom of speech, press, and assembly—yes; but also freedom from disease and want and fear! In America we have the makings of liberty; but we must proceed with all possible dispatch to produce the finished product.

A sure test of whether we in America take liberty seriously will be found in our willingness to apply rigorously that corollary of freedom, namely, equality of opportunity. And whatever else is meant by equality of opportunity in a democracy, surely it must mean the guarantee that opportunity for public service of whatever nature and kind is open to merit without any regard whatever for race or color or national origin. The best public servant is the person who can best do the job at hand. Prejudice in such matters shows our utter lack of understanding of what liberal democracy means. We are making some headway in equality in the field of public service but it is painfully slow. It would seem that there should be no question of such equality in the field of defense and that skill alone would determine who should fly a plane, steer a ship, dive a submarine, or drive a tank. That there is controversy about such matters shows how far we have yet to go in achieving democracy in other and more intimate areas of our civic and social life. But it is not in the matter of race alone that lack of equality of opportunity is found. Great sections of America cannot in our system provide the resources necessary to guarantee equality of educational opportunities for whites or Negroes. A special Commission marshaled unanswerable evidence on this score and pointed a way out in the form of a model act of Congress but as yet nothing has come of it. And there are many more possible illustrations. Liberty and equality are great words with great meanings but by now it should be evident to all that liberty and equality are not enough. There must be cooperation in the practice of liberty and in the use of opportunity. In America we still

have much to learn in the instrumenting of liberty and equality with techniques that will make these great values real in terms of concrete goods for all the people. We have the idealism, the intelligence, and the resources to do this. It yet remains to prove that we have the will.

What Will Japan Do Now?

WALTER B. BULLEN

In recent years Japan has held the initiative in the eastern Pacific area. In connection with her China war she has undermined and even directly assailed occidental interests. Great Britain and France have yielded at point after point. The Soviet Union, however, has resolutely resisted Japan. The disputed territory where Korea meets the Maritime Province, Russia retained. From the more recent fighting along the border of Outer Mongolia the Japanese reported more casualties than did the Finns when invaded by the Soviets.

Statistics have constantly shown Japan to be astonishingly dependent upon the western democracies. From them she has derived some 85 per cent of her war supplies. Japan is a great maritime power with concentration of activity in the western Pacific. During the operations which culminated in the fall of Canton and of Hankow 50 per cent of the shipping utilized was chartered from European democracies. Fully one-half of this tonnage flew the Union Jack.

The Dutch have long tacitly relied upon the British fleet for the retention of their Pacific colonies. When, however, in 1938 the French and the Australians discussed joint defense measures with the British, Holland putting her hopes upon a policy of strict neutrality declined to participate. After her hostilities with the Thais, Indo-China—having no munitions industry—could offer no serious resistance to Japanese encroachments. The Australians, however, poured their tens of thousands of volunteers into Malaya, their recognized first line of defense. The United States steadily strengthened their naval and air forces in the Philippines. By the middle of January it was apparent that "southward expansion" by Japan would be a foolhardy venture. Public apprehension was, however, little abated. Understandable British indisposition to risk any extension of the area of international conflict retarded the development of the American policy of step-by-step restriction of sales to Japan. But in the last few days Britain has boldly moved to cut off trade with Japan.

While Japanese militarists have occasionally indulged in inspiriting braggadocio, they have been prudent in action. The chauvinists early demanded the occupation of the Netherlands Indies. They represented the situation as a "heaven-sent opportunity such as might not recur in a thousand years." Their clamor went for naught and they had to content themselves with aspersions upon the government as adhering to a formal and barren morality, a morality which subserved western interests and disregarded their paramount duty to the people of Japan.

The prospects for peace in the Far East and elsewhere would perhaps be substantially increased if we Americans should bring under control our disposition to rebuke, to discredit, to humble those whose course we disapprove. Grant that Japan's policies in the last ten years have undermined the peace structure of the world and brought immeasurable misery upon China. The crushing of Japan is not the thing to be sought. Have we not yet learned the major lesson of the Treaty of Versailles? Surely the only satisfactory peace, the only sound peace, the only safe peace is one of consent. The perfect peace would be one which met the legitimate demands and served the substantial needs of all parties concerned. Such a peace could be accepted gladly, heartily, unreservedly by all. The notion that in a peace settlement it is desirable to discredit even the militarists of a nation deemed guilty of aggression is evidence of shallow and immature thought. Obviously a peace would be better received and command fairer prospect of permanent success which left no element in a country dissatisfied. It is the thesis of this article that such an ideal peace is practicable. Discussions in specialized magazines have long since shown that there is a large measure of agreement among the informed as to the essentials for a sound peace in the Far East. T. A. Bisson, the oriental expert of the Foreign Policy Association, wrote about the end of November, 1939: "A thoroughgoing settlement of the Far Eastern conflict is definitely within the bounds of possibility." As the *Christian Century* illuminatingly observes: "Lasting peace in the Far East cannot be worked out in terms of negotiations limited to two parties. . . . What is required is a general solution, taking into account all the problems of the Asiatic and the Pacific areas."

Japan proper is ten thousand square miles smaller than the state of California. Of its surface but 15 per cent is level. No other country in the world has a population of 2,750 per square mile of tillable land. It is only through industrialization that the Japanese can hope to maintain themselves at home and anticipate a gradually rising standard of life. For their welfare, assured access to raw materials and extensive foreign markets are indispensable. "Export or explode" sums up the situation. "In 1936 of the one hundred and twenty-seven countries (including colonies) that imported cotton (goods) from Japan seventy-eight had restrictive measures directed primarily at Japanese exports, consisting of quotas, import licensing systems, mutual production agreements, discriminatory tariffs, exchange controls, and other barriers." An American investigation made early in 1937 disclosed that within the previous three years forty-seven administrations had raised tariffs or imposed quotas against Japanese goods. England early attained and long retained industrial pre-eminence. When Germany under Wilhelm II went out for both economic and political leadership, the world was doomed to war. Our former ambas-

sador to Japan, William R. Castle, in the *Atlantic Monthly* of last October, discussed the implications of Japan's industrial pre-eminence in Asia. "A highly industrialized territory always dominates economically neighboring territories which are technologically less advanced. . . . The domination does not need to be political; it is far less likely to be resented and resisted when politics plays no part. [Such a role] by Japan ought not to mean any curtailment of trade with the rest of the world." When leading statesmen of Japan insist that they do not seek military control in Southeast Asia, but have vital interests there, they speak in strict accordance with urgent realities. For favorable trade arrangements with the Netherlands Indies, Indo-China, and Thailand, the Japanese have in recent months been pressing.

An America promoting prosperity in China and Japan may count on ample reflex benefits. Japan indeed has been our third-best customer, but vast China's potentialities have hitherto been unreleased. Good will begets good will. If the United States shows itself disposed to make all reasonable contributions to a just and permanent peace, the Japanese will feel free to yield to those impulses of courtesy and dignity and considerateness which are second nature to them in personal intercourse. They would feel ashamed not to go so far as others in the way of honorable, just, and generous treatment.

Modern Japan has been oriented toward the Anglo-Saxon nations. "They sold her machinery, taught her how to use it and bought her products." These peoples during the last years became alienated from Japan. Consequently there has been a double reason why Japan's leaders should seek support elsewhere. The policy of military alliance with Germany had been persistently urged, and signs were pointing to its negotiation. When the Nazi-Soviet agreements were announced, a military mission was in Italy en route to Berlin. The Japanese were deeply mortified. Promptly the government resigned and, contrary to custom, every member of it retired. But none could view with equanimity the complete isolation of Japan. The government really had to make the best of an awkward situation and come to terms with Germany. It had nowhere else to go! And so, after a year's time, the Pact of Berlin was signed.

Many assume that the Japanese army would never agree to withdraw from China and forfeit its gains there. Not if assured larger, permanent advantages? Military operations were a means to ends of national importance. Might not military men even claim some credit for favorable terms secured?

Effort after effort has been made by Japan's governments to meet her basic needs and to insure the rising standard of living that her alert and progressive people demand. The masses of Japan have several times been led to believe that the happy status was about to be achieved. Each time the people's hopes have been disappointed, and their burden has become the heavier. The misery has now reached its maximum. Last January 1st, the normal day of jubilation and felicitation, both the premier and the foreign minister announced to the people "a tragic year"; "no end in sight" has been the doleful word of authority. At this dark time, who would have the hardihood to oppose a peace settlement which adequately met the legitimate needs of Japan?

The complete evacuation of occupied China would be in line with previous Japanese action in similar situations. In 1932 after the dislodging of the Nineteenth Route Army from the vicinity of Shanghai, the Japanese agreed to the demilitarization of the area of hostilities and immediately withdrew their troops. Upon the conclusion of the Portsmouth Treaty of 1905 the Japanese armies were demobilized without waiting for parallel action by the Russians, which was in fact deferred. The Chinese Eastern Railway, up to the present capital of Manchukuo, and the leased territory about Port Arthur were transferred from Russia to Japan. The Chinese recovered control of an area as large as Germany between the two wars. During the Allied-American intervention in eastern Siberia, following the collapse of Czarist Russia, the Japanese forces were in a heavy majority. They had indeed established themselves in the country and taken over local industries and other interests with a view, it appeared, to continuing possession. All was given up; there was nothing to show for the money spent.

A soundly liberal peace settlement would bring to Japan the following major gains: (1) The Japanese would receive from the Western Powers interested in the Pacific recognition of the principle of racial equality upon which she had set her heart at Versailles; (2) the Japanese would rejoice in the winding up in the Far East, or at least in a substantial reduction, of the western imperialism against which they have honestly felt that they were supporting the cause of Asia in general; (3) the Japanese would be assured of the means of livelihood and material progress. Would not a Japanese government which had negotiated such a treaty confidently anticipate the plaudits of its people?

A treaty will afford prospect of enduring peace not according to whether or not certain negotiators, who may soon be out of office, are to be credited with good faith, but rather accordingly as it deals with the realities of the international situation and represents the substantial interests of the signatory nations. A treaty's claim to sanctity loses validity in proportion as it fails to accord with justice and to recognize the needs of changing times.

In general, national policies are not constant, but shift as conditions change. Adventurous policy yields to conservatism after a time, and the latter has to give way in its turn. It is something like the swaying of a pendulum. A swing far to one side may be followed by an equivalent swing in the contrary direction. It is sometimes the case when a tendency has about run its course, that outside observers have at length become so accustomed to it as to deem it permanent. The tide has been running toward traditionalism for some years in Japan; perhaps a turn now in the tide would be normal. Are not the Japanese fed up with ten years of crisis? In case there is a beneficent peace settlement, will they not turn again with relish to liberal ways and internationalism? With the pressure upon the Japanese people at its highest and the standard of living at its lowest, unhappy memories are accumulating. Peace would bring a measure of relief and would arouse hope. Would there not ensue a revulsion of feeling toward the quasi-totalitarian policy of the war days?

Nowhere now are orientals fighting occidentals. World War II need never begin. In time of war, prepare for peace; yes, prepare peace.

1942—Utopia Triumphant

An Introduction to a Friendly World of Garden Cities

DAVID JOBMAN

Man is the most remarkable product of a creative providence. Like those scintillating, thrilling, advancing and retiring starry constellations above our heads, man's progress towards a nobler fate has been an amazingly tortuous ascent; now ignominiously hidden in the mire and degrading practices of the jungle, now in a glorious tilt for causes so dear to the hearts of mankind's true saints and martyrs. Ever so desperately slow in grasping fundamentals, as a rational being, he eventually does manage to learn to profit from error and experience. Then he wakes to make the startling discovery that there is always a sensible and decent way to an amicable solution of most trying problems.

But it required the "exterminating havoc" of the *blitzkrieg* ravages of a second World War, with its unforgettable nightmares and irretrievable losses, for all men and women of all the nations to grasp the great truth that wars—even the most successful ones on the fields of battle—settle nothing; that under modern conditions, the prosecution of war becomes a senseless, immoral, cruel, wholesale slaughter of innocents. It is an act of brigandage most revolting against the laws of God and man, where all human values and Christian ethics are religiously sacrificed upon the altars of war and greed. Only the actual visitations of the crimes of modern warfare could bring the conviction to all that human suffering, bigotry, intolerance, persecution, and bloodshed are the very sinews of all wars; and that those guilty of war are the most criminal offenders among men. In truth, war in our times is no more a struggle between equally armored and armed warriors coming face to face for mortal combat under some guise of decency and honor. In essence, it is merely a cold-blooded destruction of peaceful homes: women, children, and the helpless aged and infirm first victims on the endless casualty lists. To descend methodically in the haze upon a peaceful countryside or metropolis and machine-gun its humble multitudes of unwarring humanity; to discharge a huge cargo of explosives from above the clouds in the midst of a house of worship, a hospital or a school; to send to the bottom of the sea ships loaded with materials serving human needs; to blockade and expose to starvation, disease, and mental derangement entire communities who know nothing about war and want less its ravages,—to do all these dreadfully barbarous and inhuman things and similar iniquities as they were actually perpetrated in Spain, China, Poland, Finland, Belgium, Holland, France, Ethiopia, Albania, Palestine, over the fair British Islands and the meticulous Germany, such performances do not require a real sense of heroic chivalry! This might explain why a democratic nation is so slow and difficult to rouse to the instincts, ordeals, and destructive passions of war.

Under the impetus of horrible experiences and a new reawakening of reason, the incredibly utopian actually took place: a bloodless revolution inaugurating a new moral order with an enduring peace appeared upon the horizon of a blotted civilization. It began with the return home from the front of the first *blitzkrieg* divisions. Victorious on the battlefield—sowing death, despotism, terror, and destruction of local cultures in the conquest of foreign lands and smaller nations—the soldiers on leave were shocked and distressed to find their own beautiful towns devastated and beloved ones scattered or huddled underground in a state of physical and mental unease, if not of actual deterioration. The retaliatory enemy attacks from the sky and the blockade had gradually made their effective appearance in the very streets and upon the very highways of their own supposedly impregnable fatherland. A heart-breaking contempt for human dignity, human moral values, and human life was the inevitable fruit of a devastating struggle for extermination. A languid murmur of the victims in face of a haughty display of brutal force glared its spectacular gruesome monstrosities of self-deception and disintegration. Human traits of kindliness, culture, and generosity have been crucified and banished; the very texts of humanity being devoured by the flames of a rejuvenated barbarism. There was neither mercy nor consideration for anyone from those ravages of roused passions and war: the infant and the aged, the participant and non-participant, the schoolhouse and the hospital ward, the factory and the library—alike, the rich and the pauper—all had to pay their toll in misery, insecurity, and blood; for there was no hiding place deep enough and far enough that could escape the horrible death and destruction from the hands of an invisible foe. All safeguards against terror were removed by the very advancement in science which was meant to crown mankind with security and bliss!

Wherever they went, the returning warriors were chagrined by the sight of long lines of vehicles loaded with hastily-fashioned caskets, awaiting their turn to be interned in the greatly enlarged burial grounds. Fast and many were those dropping by the roadside before their time. There were motley crowds of women, children, and helpless aged from distant towns and villages, whose homes became smoldering ruins, awaiting some benevolent disposition—all pathetically bewildered refugees in their own lands. There were endless rows at the hospitals and at the bread stalls. Fear, deprivation, and a tormenting silence, people afraid of their own shadows, reigned supreme. To utter one's thoughts, to reveal one's despair, to share one's pains and prayers in public was treason! Were these the laurels of victory? And the soldiers from the victorious fronts, who could not be hushed as readily as their beaten kin at home, began to think and to query; first timidly, then more demanding as they went on.

"In the name of common sense and human decency," went up the universal cry, "what is it all about and what matter of real merit is there that cannot be settled peaceably, democratically, and immediately, at the council table, without recourse to those savageries of modern warfare; and where is the gain which can ever repay that wholesale destruction from the sky and those horribly inhuman material and spiritual devastations left behind in the bloody trails of insanely rushing, death-striking, murderous armored divisions of mechanized combat?"

The soldiers were immediately joined by their townsfolk, finding relief in a free expression of long-suppressed sentiments and woes. Once the common people of the Old World dared to break their chains of silence, there was no power that could stop their advance: established despotisms began to quake and those mighty in their brutalities, would-be-modern Caesars, found their magic spells (supported by bigotry, ignorance, and blood-stained bayonets) vanished, and themselves in dust, facing universal condemnation.

Deputies "of the people, by the people, for the people" were freely chosen over the heads and desires of the totalitarian despots and their minions. From village, town, and city the news of a liberated public opinion reasserting the right of free humanity spread across the borders and to the remotest active fronts. The so-called responsible leaders who started the frightful conflagration of the second World War were the first to scamper and to run for safety, in vain trying to escape public trial. Some made an end with their own hands to their most criminal lives. Popular national assemblies representing the war-scarred nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa issued a call for the immediate cessation of the immoral destruction of life and wealth. In this first call to sanity and order, all belligerents were invited to meet in Geneva, Switzerland, for a friendly discussion of all problems of common concern, seeking a peaceful solution. In less than four weeks of earnest consultation and study, the International Parliament of the Association of Free and Sovereign Nations of the continents of the Old World had made its momentous decisions: a new moral order had dawned in a world of chaos. The three continents, long drenched with the blood of manhood, entered a new era of Enlightenment, engaging the best minds and talents of a humanity called back to reason. Wars were effectively outlawed. Armies and navies were transformed into industrial, agricultural, and cultural agencies of peaceful relations between nations and continents. It was made possible by that peaceful demonstration of an aroused public revolt which dared to transfer the powers of authority from the hands of the tyrants to the hands of the peoples' true friends fearlessly picked by popular acclaim. These great powers of society were organized to work for the progressive and humanitarian purposes, dictated by a liberated will and conscience of a moral society.

To cope with a normal diversity of type, interests and local habit, tolerance, consideration, persuasion, and moral injunction were instituted, replacing fears, strife, prejudice, and persecution. Ill will and drudgeries were replaced by brotherhood and a universal well-being. Friendly collective bargaining upon the sole basis of give-and-take, live-and-let-live, became the unifying ties promising protective permanency and tangible results. Real security, genuine prosperity and abiding happiness and peace were actually made within reach of all, leaving no nooks for those controversies roused by age-long injustices. Human honor and confidence in the best in man returned to cement the fellowship between individuals, groups, nations, and races, as well as warring creeds. With freedom, free initiative and popular discussion serving mankind on all fronts, there was no place left for those unhappy, bellicose, aggressive practices which made life a burden and this otherwise beautiful and most promising world a veritable chamber of horrors.

Acting upon the advice of the world's leadership in the creative fields of science, industry, agriculture, commerce, labor, education, and universal religious fellowship, a complete inventory of the natural wealth, skill, and labor willing and able to work was undertaken, with the free and enthusiastic coöperation of each nation affected. A rough outline of material and cultural needs of the many peoples involved was produced. Based upon these records, it was decreed by the unanimous consent of the Parliament of Nations embracing the Old World that the scattered and unlimited resources of nature within their jurisdiction be made fully and freely accessible to all the nations of the world, large and small, strong and weak, according to their legitimate needs. Reason, law and order, justice and true equality of opportunity in all walks of moral living became the established pillars of the new order. Individually and collectively, all useful and ennobling labor became the sole honorable pursuits sought by all and freely offered to all. English, German, and French were adopted as the three universal languages to be taught in all the schools. Ample, free and full facilities were left for the further growth and enjoyment of all native tongues and cultures which harbor the delightfully peculiar traits forming the heritage of each racial group and necessary for their individual pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. As already mentioned above, all wasteful and unproductive implements of war and all man-power organized for warfare were gradually and most intelligently turned to the services of the new humanized civilization, dedicated to industry, art, and a moral unfoldment of human personality and social splendor. Under such a stimulus of exemplary behavior, the very jealousies and discord leading to the brutalizing practices of man-hunt and war were uprooted, never to recur.

Within each nation, the scientific and universal employment of all available machinery and skill, wedded to willing labor, abolished unemployment, slums. Work was made pleasant and hours few and well spaced to accomplish the necessary tasks. Plenty of time was left for study, experimentation, wholesome moral competition, play, and like pursuits. Under the ethical trusteeship of the fair representatives of the Parliament of Nations embracing the Old World and its many cultures, all means of production, distribution, and communication became the concern of all, finding easy solution in the friendly spirit of service, public awards, moral sportsmanship, and mutual aid. Each individual, group, and racial division gladly and freely contributed of its best towards the common stock of well-being and growth. The greatest good of the greatest number was an actuality and no more the impracticable web or vision of impotent minds. Those dreadful five horses of War, Death, Conquest, Famine, and Pestilence preying upon mankind for ages, transforming a most promising world into a "bog of defeat and despair," had finally met their doom under sentence of human enlightenment and universal good will. Even those most disruptive barriers of color, creed, and language, one and all, were turned to the blissful services of creative and moral living.

All this and more, in like trend, came to pass, because a moral society had willed it so. And it is the moral society which has the democratic will and way so to organize and labor as to create the conditions necessary to sustain, perpetuate, and steadily to perfect the ethical and justice-loving free citizen; who, in turn, is the very foundation making it possible for

the friendly world of garden cities to take root, grow, and happily, peaceably to expand—perhaps to dimensions which might some day embrace the five continents of our world. In such manner, even the universal fellowship enshrining all mankind in one brotherhood might become a truly and fully materialized Utopia Triumphant.

What of the immediate night? . . . What of that "immense pool of misery and want" engulfing the continents of our turbulent world as these lines are being penned? What of those hourly nightmares of murder, terror, pestilence, famine, and uncertainties for the next minute's life that are the fate of mankind the world over, ruled as it is by a most brutalizing jungle law? What of the inhumanities of those mighty imposters and would-be saviors of mankind who destroy the human body, torture the human soul, crucify the living conscience? What of the heaps and mangled ruins of a slaughtered mankind? What of those beautifully pastoral and romantic peaceful countries suddenly turned, in these our very days of a highly-boasting civilization, into concentration camps and living hells of torture and death? What of those silent voices of those millions of refugees (the salt of the earth) tormented by perpetual fears of an uncertain tomorrow? What of those screaming headlines and broadcasts announcing death and destruction over the fairest centers of human habitation, with their repeated black-outs of life, humanity, and hope? And what of those ruined citadels of culture and enlightenment and beauty; of those hunted and haunted tortured sons and daughters of the world's noblest minds and hearts? Yes, what of the night? Well,

Think, in this batter'd Caravanserai
Whose Portals are alternate Night and Day,
How Sultan after Sultan with his pomp
Abode his destin'd Hour, and went his way.

These modern despots and their totalitarian inhumanities, with all the buried Caesars "beneath the Couch of Earth" must soon descend; with the Friendly World of Garden Cities becoming a throbbing reality and nearer to realization, in measure as greater numbers of humble humanity and their true leaders accept the reign of reason, of justice, of tolerance, and peace. It is within our own power and our own hands and our own good will to make ". . . the most of what we yet may spend, Before we too into the Dust descend. . . ."

Where there is a good will there is a right way. Do not unto others what you do not wish to have done unto you. This is not a theologically platonic mood of a sterile believer. It is the very pragmatic way that offers the very key to reveal props of a Democracy triumphant, with a Utopia Triumphant assured. In this moral relationship of mankind, human life and liberty and opportunity are held sacred and inviolable; sovereignty is granted to each, with due respect; the ways of the jungle are banished, and so is frightful retribution; the clashes engendered by fears, hatreds, persecution, and terror are forgotten, replaced by an identity of moral interests. That much was learned for certain—*Veritas magna est et praevalebit—the truth is mighty and will prevail.* In the darkest of hours, Hope Eternal springs in the hearts of living humanity —a hope that no tyranny has yet discovered how to silence despite all its foul efforts.

Trumpets on New Horizons

EDITED BY LUCIA TRENT, RALPH CHEYNEY

Freedom

I do not dwell in caves of creed
That scar the plateaus of the mind,
My residence is not the den
To which the fettered are assigned:

My house is windowed by the world,
My room is closeted by skies,
With reason for my avenue,
I tread with footsteps of surmise!

EUGENE GINSBERG.

Surplus

There is far too much cotton and wool, we are told,
But Poverty's children are ragged and cold.
We have a huge surplus of butter and wheat.
A child weeps with hunger on Poverty Street.

MILDRED GOFF.

Death and Life

Not that men die, but that they kill in hate
Is death. The rankling anger that survives
The combat, this the living contemplate
With bitterness, recalling blighted lives.

We all must die, and good it is to keep
Our rendezvous with death when life is spent;
The curse is that which sends us to our sleep
Before our souls achieve their full intent.

Not that men live, but that they serve the good
Is life. And truest happiness revives
When all unite in lasting brotherhood,
With kindly deeds restoring broken lives.

CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS.

Poetry Speaks

I sing in valleys—dark . . . and shout,
And rise above the ocean's roar;
I seal abysmal caves of doubt,
And open Heaven's door.

MYRTLE BELLE WARD.

The Greater Thanksgiving

Be this my cause for thanks no wealth can bring:
Within my heart I can conceive a perfect thing.
There is no space too wide for me to gain,
No heights to which I may not yet attain,
And though the pressure of the world may grieve
When joy is crushed and cherised hopes deceive,
Yet in the darkest hour a light will shine,
Some bond be loosed that marred the full design,
And with fresh courage I shall strive and rise
On one flight nearer to the things I prize.

THOMAS BRUCE REESE.

Parties and the Democratic Principles

VICTOR S. YARROS

The totalitarian states have abolished the party system. They do not call themselves absolute tyrannies; they do not admit that they have enslaved the individual and suppressed civil, political, and scientific freedom. They claim to have established *higher* and *better* democracies. When everybody agrees with the Fuehrer, one party is of course sufficient. Those who do not agree need no party and cannot have any, since they are in concentration camps, prison, or exile!

The odd and discouraging fact is that many upholders of democracy now entertain serious doubts regarding the utility of the party system. They would not object to its liquidation, if that could be effected without embracing Hitlerism or Fascism. The abuses of the party system are glaring, indeed, and the disillusioned democrats can render a valuable service to free institutions and popular government by frankly raising the question whether these abuses are *inherent* in the party system or mere excrescences removable by intelligence and good will.

The question is by no means new. George Washington's denunciation of partyism—it was known then as "factionalism"—has not been forgotten by thoughtful students of American political history. Washington saw no necessity for parties, and his own elections were achieved without that instrumentality. He witnessed the small beginnings of partyism, however, and he did not relish them. To him they were symptoms of moral decay, of unpatriotic intolerance, of anarchy in the body politic. His warning to the republic against factionalism was stern and impressive.

It proved futile, because the differences between the Jeffersonians and the Hamiltonians were too deep and too important to be adjusted without an open break and an appeal to the people by means of issues formulated in so-called platforms. The early issues are still with us, even though neither of the two major parties has been wholly consistent with respect to them.

The party system in a democratic government is apparently inevitable. Only one alternative system has ever been tentatively proposed, and that, on close examination, proves to be unworkable and impracticable. The reference is to the plan sketched in the two-volume work published by a Russian thinker and writer, M. M. Ostrogorsky, about a quarter of a century ago. In that able and scholarly work the League plan was suggested as a desirable substitute for the party plan. The British Free Trade League, the American Anti-Saloon League, the non-partisan League of Nations Association—these and similar agencies have certainly demonstrated that men and women who differ politically and belong to different parties can and do work together harmoniously for some specific and urgent purpose. Thus the League idea is an invaluable contribution to political science and political technique. It does not follow, however, that it offers a dependable and effective *substitute* for the party idea. In a party, men work for several purposes simultaneously and these purposes may be, and often are, interrelated, subordinated to, and logically deducible from, a general and central principle. The first parties in America illustrated this truth. The Jeffersonians had several planks in their platforms, and so had the Hamiltonians. The situation demanded parties, not leagues. A league to promote several purposes is a party, and has all the virtues and all the vices of a party.

Of course, the two-party system, where it grows out of social and economic conditions, is preferable to the multiple party system as known under the French Republic or the short-lived German Republic. Even in the United States the two-party system has been tempered and vitalized by the minor parties—the Greenbackers, the Populists, the Socialists, the Farmer-Labor party. Suppress the minor parties, the advanced parties that fight for unpopular reforms without the hope of capturing the White House or Congress, and the major parties degenerate into organized appetites, and forget principles. Means become ends. Fear of defeat paralyzes them, and progress is barred for an indefinite period.

We must now return to the question: What can be done to reduce to a minimum the grave abuses which the party system develops everywhere—timidity, cowardice, shortsighted opportunism, sacrifice of professed goals, love of spoils and power?

One serious effect of these abuses is not stressed as often as it should be—namely, the degradation and perversion of the pre-election campaigns. We hear much about the *education* of the huge and heterogeneous electorate by these campaigns. The fond notion that a political campaign is a great debate in which the several parties appeal to the reason of the electorate, present the actual issues involved fairly and conscientiously, and thus clarify difficult and complex problems, is based not on facts, but on wishful thinking. Campaigns are, as a rule, dirty, bitter, dishonest, and mendacious. Issues are distorted. Appeals are made to known prejudices and hatreds. Intimidation is practiced, fears aroused. Reckless statements are common, and when a lie is exposed, no apology follows. The lie may even be repeated, and other lies added.

Our campaigns have always been dirty, but some have been dirtier than others. The last one was almost as vicious and malicious as the McKinley-Bryan campaign of 1896. Bryan was called anarchist, repudiator of national and individual debts, demagogue, champion of immoral ideas, what not, and all because he advocated bimetalism at a certain ratio. McKinley, the Republican candidate, had himself favored bimetalism in Congress and had complained that President Cleveland, in his fiscal policies, had "dishonored one of our precious metals, silver." Wage-workers were told that if Bryan should be elected, the factories would not reopen on the morrow of the balloting and they would better stay at home. Was this education? Was it education, in the last campaign, to tell the voters that President Roosevelt had telephoned to those gangsters, Hitler and Mussolini, and had sold Czechoslovakia down the river? Was it education to warn the voters that the republic was in danger and that it could be saved only by defeating Roosevelt, who was deceiving the country, signing secret treaties, and plotting to take the United States into the war?

But it is unnecessary to multiply illustrations of willful dishonesty and outrageous mendacity. No wonder many self-respecting persons shun politics and the

whole political process. No wonder the very word politician is almost synonymous with trickster, humbug, or hypocrite.

To attend a partisan political meeting in the midst of a hard-fought election is to despair of humanity. The audience is easily converted by rant and vehemence into a frantic mob. It wildly cheers vituperation, abuse, and mud-slinging. It is not interested in argument; it wants poison gas directed at the "enemy."

The party system cannot long survive such discreditable and indecent tactics. Hosts of persons will turn in disgust to the totalitarian alternative. We must give earnest thought to the problem of cleaning up and purging our campaigns, of bettering our partisan strategy and tactics. Drifting will not mend matters. Pollyanna optimism will not solve the problem.

Slow and genuine education alone can solve it. But the education must start early—in the grade school, in all our churches, in our forums, clubs, civic organizations, and in the respectable press. Colleges and universities should offer courses in propaganda analysis, and should teach students the difference between educational speeches and demagoguery, between a fair discussion of real issues and mere invective and billingsgate.

Courses in legitimate, intellectually honest debating are possible and needful. Our students are not taught intellectual integrity; but they could be, by striking examples taken from our history and from current politics. They can be shown how not to do it, and how to do it, if democracy is to work and the people are to be intelligent and sincere in exercising their political rights and privileges.

Such education and training will, at the very start, utterly reject the fallacious and preposterous idea that "the duty of the opposition is to oppose." Many evil practices can be traced to that false slogan. The duty of the opposition is to watch, offer honest criticism *where it is warranted,* and suggest alternative and sounder measures. It is equally the duty of the opposition to support proper and necessary measures, where inaction is dangerous and unwise. No enlightened friend of democracy objects to candid and vigorous criticism when it is justified and deserved. No one demands silence on the part of the opposition when it has something helpful to say. The objection is to falsification, distortion, and plain lying for the sake of party success.

The two-party system can be revivified and purified, rendered worthy and useful to democracies. Under the party system coöperation in dealing with great problems is not impossible, given the right leadership. Problems are solved by science, common sense, and good will. The party system need not banish these factors. Where they are banished, the party system is abused, not utilized as an effective means to an end—the end being good government, progressive government, unselfish government.

Let us not, said Lord Morley, ask more of human nature than it is capable of yielding. Bigots and fanatics we shall have with us always, even in theology and letters. But we must fight partisan bigotry in democratic politics, fight it and reduce it to a minimum. This, surely, is not asking too much of average human nature in a land as blessed as the United States.

The Study Table

The Great Hatred

THE GREAT HATRED. *By Maurice Samuel. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.* 209 *pp.* $2.00.
WHERE HOPE LIES. *By Leo W. Schwartz. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc.* 143 *pp.* $1.50.

Here are two more books upon the problem of anti-Semitism to add to the increasing flow of such, as a consequence of the recrudescence of the discussion of the eternal Jewish problem under the influence of the happenings in the totalitarian countries and their effect upon the democracies.

They are, however, two books of totally different character.

The Great Hatred by Maurice Samuel makes an approach that is almost entirely novel. For the first time there is enunciated, with invincible courage and with irrefutable logic, the theory that anti-Semitism is *not* a Jewish problem, but that it constitutes an attack upon the whole Judaic-Christian concept of civilization.

The other volume, *Where Hope Lies,* by Leo W. Schwartz is an intelligent discussion of the same issues from the vantage point of democracy only, and the author pins his faith upon a realization of the danger in the virus penetrating into the vitals of the American people and finds "hope" if that danger be averted.

If Mr. Samuel's thesis be accepted all the panaceas offered by Mr. Schwartz comprehend only "fiddling while Rome burns." Mr. Samuel envisages anti-Semitism as a disease of Christendom, and of far greater danger to Christendom than to Jews, no matter how many individual Jews in countless centers are in anguish today.

He rejects the ideology repeated *ad nauseam* by most speakers and preachers and writers that anti-Semitism is merely another manifestation of "difference," such as the dislike for foreigners evidenced everywhere by natives, or the superiority complex of those in the United States who came over in the *Mayflower* or soon thereafter, for those who came to these shores a little later. This is the accepted and almost always complacent attitude of the general run of so-called "liberal" individuals. Mr. Samuel sharply challenges this illusion and sees in anti-Semitism a very definite challenge to Christianity.

He sees in it a clear resultant of revolt against the ideology of Jesus and of the whole ethical concept of Christianity by a paganized world peopled with folks who have never honestly accepted them.

He sees in the picture not merely the ravings of *Mein Kampf* but the potentialities of a complete rejection of the Christian ideal in the not very distant future.

If this diagnosis be accepted we have before us not merely a life-and-death struggle between totalitarianism and democracy, but a complete negation of the Judaic-Christian approach to life.

Mr. Samuel unflinchingly places the blame, not so much upon the professional anti-Semite as upon church-

men of high fidelity and upon anemic thinkers who refuse to think the problem through to a logical conclusion.

In limpid prose oftimes rising to grandeur, Mr. Samuel projects his thesis with argument upon argument, the accuracy of which cannot be easily refuted.

His book is very frankly addressed to the Christian world and not to Jews, for he regards the problem as not a Jewish problem, as for ages it has been described, but a Christian problem threatening the whole structure of Christendom in spite of its power, pomp, circumstance, and vested interests.

In twenty-one brief but forceful chapters is unfolded the whole tragic story of the unwillingness of the Christian world to be honest.

May Mr. Samuel speak for himself for a moment:

> Your reluctance to see clearly on this focal issue springs more from a moral than an intellectual obtuseness. The inertia of the mind is weighted with the fear of self-understanding, fear of the confession which must accompany self-understanding and the purgation which must accompany confession.

Again:

> Do not exclaim, either, "Here is another Jew, unbalanced by the disasters which have overtaken his people, forgetting that these have now been caught up and obliterated in a universal tide." I repeat: It is not of my people that I am thinking primarily.

Not only does Mr. Samuel make this clear, but he does not spare his fellow Jews in the process of his diagnosis of the disease.

> The sin of the Jews has been the same as the sin of the Christians, namely, the fear of placing the issue on the level to which it belongs. . . Fantastic as it may sound, there are even Jews who say, "If we stop talking about anti-Semitism it will disappear—it is our protests that keep it alive." To meet immorality with moral abdication is the last stage of internal decay.

It is utterly impossible within the compass of a review such as this to reproduce all the evidence that Mr. Samuel has so assiduously marshalled in support of his thesis.

There is, for instance, a magnificent exposition of the problem of "peace" in the sense of its negation of "force" for which the Judaic-Christian ideology has always stood and which infuriates the proponents of the "might is right" theory.

To this fury, which is now an obsession, much of the fanatical cruelty may be ascribed but the logical sequence of the acceptance of this theory is again that the great hatred is not of Jews but of the Judaic-Christian philosophy.

Mr. Schwartz, in *Where Hope Lies,* has approached his task from what can best be described as a domestic point of view.

He feels that the danger lies in the "it can't happen here" attitude, endeavors to point out to Americans that anti-Semitism and democracy are incompatible, and pleads for prompt and vigorous action to cope with its spreading. Americans are asked to protest vehemently against this violation of the idealism of democracy and to resist the insidious spread of an alien philosophy.

Mr. Schwartz approaches Mr. Samuel's conception when he remarks:

> It is clear that anti-Semitism is the first phase of the persecution of Christians.

It must be self-evident, however, that if one accepts Mr. Samuel's thesis that anti-Semitism threatens Christianity as much as, nay more than, Jews or Judaism, as in actuality it threatens both, then the plea that hope may be found in a greater tolerance in the democracies (what is left of them) in general, or in the United States in particular, is wholly invalid or at best the treatment of a cold sore where drastic medicine or surgery is suggested for a festering cancer eating at the heart of the whole body politic of the religious world.

It is no disparagement of Mr. Schwartz's book, *per se,* but it is my opinion that Mr. Samuel's thesis has been proved. His deductions are correct and his suggestions dynamic. They call for no delay in their acceptance, and impose the "only hope" for the survival of Judaism and Christianity both.

Mr. Samuel concludes his book with a plea to America, but only on the basis of acceptance of his main contentions.

To quote his concluding paragraph:

> You will hear again soon, with a new volume, with new undertones and sibilations, the words "Jewish war!" "Anti-Christian conspirators!" "Jewish enemies of civilization!" If a flicker of sympathetic response awakens in you, search your heart for its meaning, and consult the records of other peoples which have been similarly tempted and have given way.

It may be only wishful thinking on my part but it may well be that this book will awaken Christian consciousness and dissipate Jewish cowardice, so that with hands and hearts entwined the Judaic-Christian ideology may yet be salvaged to uplift and ennoble generations yet unborn.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

Raising the Power of Prayer

LIVING PRAYERFULLY. *By Kirby Page. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc.* 523 *pp.* $2.00.

Inspiring passages abound in prose and poetry, but too often they fail to inspire and almost invariably they inspire too little. The fault is not with authors but with readers, yet it is largely authors who must improve the transmission of inspiration. One author who brilliantly is solving the central problem of education: the creation of civilization by the conversion of literary creations into character and conduct is Kirby Page. In this, his latest book, with beautiful practicality he shows how to transform poetry and prose-as-significant-as-poetry into prayer, and prayer into practice. What greater service can be rendered?

Most of Dr. Page's big book is an anthology of poems and prose embodying "the spiritual stimuli needed if we are to practice the presence of God and to follow Jesus' way of life: awe and adoration, praise and thanksgiving, contrition and confession, aspiration and commitment, petition and intercession, communion and fellowship, social action." Many of those represented in this magnificent compilation are UNITY contributors and editors—from Dr. Holmes himself to, among the poets, Angela Morgan, E. Merrill Root, Robert Whitaker, Stanton Coblentz, and your poetry editors.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

Correspondence

Congratulations!

To UNITY:

Congratulations! The correspondence in your August issue is a welcome sign that your intelligent readers are not all dead. A UNITY these days without correspondence is discouraging to its old friends.

Being one of the old "individualistic" type of liberals, I particularly rejoiced in Mrs. Neilson's thoughtful letter. As I read our history, those individualistic liberals who laid the foundation stone did it by mutual aid and cooperation in spite of some of the dictator-like authorities who thought first of themselves and their power and their continuance in office. The early history of the Massachusetts Bay Colony illustrates my point. Fortunately for the world, progress has been made possible by the wise minority.

With Hitler, the human fiend, so filled with planetary consciousness and determination to be the great world manager, before us as a horrible example, most of us feel that Willkie and all others should be true to their campaign pledges and promises. Hitler is sufficiently the supreme example of broken promises, brutality, and selfish ambition. We need no home examples.

I, too, am a member of the Community Church. I, too, admire John Haynes Holmes and all he stands for. I know him through his editorials in UNITY and the ten sermons I get each year by paying one dollar as can anyone who cannot attend his church. Also from the Declaration published on UNITY's inside cover page which Mr. Holmes presented to the UNITY Publishing Committee last January. It embodies his spirit, his ideals of a liberal publication, and should bear his signature according to the new rules of UNITY. I cannot go to his study for a frank talk about differences of opinion as can and should David Jobman who seems not to know John Haynes Holmes and what he would think of any liar, of any man so intoxicated with the idea of world management as to have lost all sense of human decency as well as humanity. Mr. Holmes does not need me to speak for him. As a pacifist hating war and what it does to those participating in it, especially the leaders, I can well understand how another pacifist feels. Hitler will be defeated and crushed, if he ever is, only by greater brutality, greater slaughter, greater destruction, and greater hate than he has called into being. As a pacifist I remember that we, the United States, carrying the light of civilization to people in darkness, broke faith with the Filipinos. I remember that Captain Funston, taking advantage of Aguinaldo's kindness and hospitality, made the plans to capture his host. I remember that our soldiers were ordered and did make hell of Samar and Batangas. I remember that the Queen of Spain through our minister agreed to all the demands of the United States government in regard to Cuba. We were set for war. We paid no attention to her official promises. Our minister resigned in humiliation. I remember Wilson's fine fourteen points. The German people were promised peace according to those fourteen points. I remember that Wilson sat through that peace conference that denied them when he should have left the peace table and come home in protest. War has a way of doing things to the best of governments. What would it profit the United States to be one of the chief bosses of the world if we lost the soul of honor, of truth, and brotherhood?

I once asked Jenkin Lloyd Jones for a motto which I recommend to the A.L.C. Board who now edits UNITY: "From a clean life to a clean city, from love of home to love of country, from love of country to love of humanity, from love of God our Father to love of man our brother." His definition of love was the sort we used to know, the self-sacrificing love, taught and illustrated by all the great religious and ethical teachers: Confucius, Buddha, Socrates, and Jesus. When asked why, after going from the smaller to the greater, in the last he went from the greatest to the least, Mr. Jones said, "Is it not much easier to love God whom we have not seen than our fellow men so frail, so trying, so often mistaken?" I think this talk of planetary love, consciousness, and management is much easier than the love of the individuals in the community about us.

I quite agree with Miss Pell: if UNITY loses its pacifist position it will lose its distinctiveness . . . and its value, and become just another journal of opinion. UNITY was not endowed to join the present trumpeters on the new horizon. We have so many of them whose trumpeting interests no one so much as themselves. There are so many new horizons, so many advocates of the "new deal," we long for assurance that the old mutual helpfulness and the old freedom will continue a part of our individual and national life to make us fit to take a helpful part in whatever comes after the chaos about us.

OLIVE COLE SMITH.

Mt. Pleasant, Iowa.

More Power to Mr. Holmes

To UNITY:

I wish to express my admiration and endorsement of the able editorials of John Haynes Holmes in the July and August numbers of UNITY. They seem to me to cover the ground and to face the issues without fear or favor. With his usual force and honesty Mr. Holmes brings to our attention facts that make pathetically ridiculous the belief that Christianity or democracy can be preserved by repudiating in practice the foundations on which they rest and destroying the freedoms which make them possible. Why try to save the tottering steeple by pulling the foundation from under it? Mr. Holmes gives us facts that others omit in this time of war madness. More power to him, and may the day soon come when UNITY takes it rightful place beside the *Christian Century* and the hundreds of ministers and laymen who believe the time has come to use the power of the spirit to redeem the world—or stop talking so much about it in times of peace.

MAY STRANATHAN.

Cumberland, Ohio.

Reply to Mr. Jobman

To UNITY:

May I call the attention of your correspondent, Mr. David Jobman, to his use of the word *reality* from a philosophic standpoint? In such context it should signify that which is permanent, that which cannot be destroyed. It points Godward and not to the evanescently concrete—the transitory and immediate.

Delisle Burns clarifies the philosophic meaning of this much abused word *"reality."* I am taking the liberty of quoting quite informally some of Mr. Jobman's words, applying them to himself, for his letter "seems to lack the perspective which makes for clear thinking and that practical guidance which must be the base of any intelligent human effort." These words, so applicable to their author, have not the slightest significance as applied to Dr. Holmes.

Any person of enough intelligence to recognize the basic principles of a sound philosophy of life could not miss the profundity of thought underlying the satirical (but in no way cynical) editorials referred to.

One might hesitate to comment on Mr. Jobman's inability to think, were it not for his absurdly paradoxical claims in regard to Dr. Holmes and his editorials—editorials the implications of which have been demonstrated by every philosophically profound mind from Confucius to Dr. Holmes himself. To this noble list we might well add the names of many of those clergymen who joined Dr. Holmes in signing the anti-war manifesto.

They were led to do this because of their quite obvious ability to think; because of their devotion to truth and their power to recognize it and act upon it.

One cannot but wonder if the discursive Mr. Jobman (who so exalts the words American and British) has ever heard of our lynchings, of our discriminatory laws, of our dishonorable dealings with the American Indians, of our massacre of the Pequots, of our massacre of the Filipinos, described by Norman Angell as being the most brutal in all history. One wonders if he can have read C. F. Andrews' book on the bombing of the Pathans by the British on the Northwest Frontier of India.

And what would be his opinion in regard to the performances of Clive and Hastings in India? Oh yes, it is true that was some time back, but what about the incarceration today of Jawaharlal Nehru and 5000 others in India for the one simple reason that they uphold the democratic principle of government? Can he show a different motive or method for the German invasion of Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Denmark from that of the British in taking over the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, the Orange Free State in South Africa, to say nothing of the Transvaal which they had solemnly pledged in the Sand River Convention not to invade?

In other words, who set Hitler the example? And in speaking of South Africa, one is reminded that there is much more than a slight resemblance between the temperament and

the aims of Cecil Rhodes and Adolf Hitler. That Hitler is even more obsessed to carry the Aryan burden than the British are at the moment to carry the "white man's burden," no one can deny; but if we are to contemplate world history as a whole, the difference exhibited by Hitler is in intensity rather than in kind, in degree rather than in motive.

When Mr. Jobman writes of "old-fashioned Americanism that is right in the hearts of our men and women", does he perhaps refer to the type described by Brooks Adams in his *Emancipation of Massachusetts*—the type that could tie a kindly old couple to the tail of a cart and flail them through the streets of Boston, and for what reason—just because they had the goodness of heart to entertain a Quaker overnight?

To whom can such words as wishful thinking, illusions, dreams, foreign ideologies apply, if not to the author of this absurdly illogical and unintelligent letter?

Will not perhaps some one of greater influence than I suggest to Mr. David Jobman that he set apart a portion of each day for the purpose of reflection, following this enforced effort by reading a few chapters from the life of Gautama, or Socrates, or the Nazarene, before making further attacks upon the basic principle of life itself as revealed by its clearest exemplifiers, remembering that hate begets hate, that war begets war, even as good will begets good will?

FLORA WHITE.

Buckland, Mass.

Slightly Saddened

TO UNITY:

As a contributing editor of UNITY, I confess myself both fascinated and slightly saddened by your July cover editorial, as well as by the chorus of enthusiastic comment in this August issue. It is, however, no surprise to me. For many months I have watched Mr. Reese veer slowly but surely toward armed intervention in this worst of all possible wars: now, at bidding of imperial Britain and communist Russia, I hear him calling for "goods to Britain now," as well as justifying President Roosevelt's outrageous occupation of Iceland. Whatever sort of guide he may have been before, he is no trustworthy one now, who deliberately suppressed (at Churchill's beck) Rudolph Hess' peace offer from his last major speech; and also insulted the 80 per cent of Americans who want no war. What has "all-out aid to Britain" to do with "Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion"—the colors still nailed to UNITY's mast-head? This is "a war for empire, to gain it, to preserve it, and to extend it"; and one in which America should have no part, remaining instead armed and ready to assume her destined duty of world mastery and world reorganization, when the world shall have burned itself out into sultry ashes. "Stay at peace in a world aflame?" cries David Jobman. Alas, that is exactly what we must do, that we be not found wanting at our rendezvous with Destiny when it calls us to create Mr. Wells' long-desired Pax Mundi.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

Janesville, Wisconsin.

A Deserved Tribute

TO UNITY:

It is a pleasure to refer in your journal, open to both pacifist and interventionist opinion, to the work of the Reverend Arthur Rowe, United Church minister in High River, Alberta, Canada. For years Mr. Rowe has held to a pacifist position and when the present war began continued to make clear his convictions in spite of decreased church attendance and misrepresentations in his church and community. The local policeman called on him and asked him to be very cautious about the subjects he chose for his sermons, in view of the war situation. Mr. Rowe jokingly asked him "Well, what would you want me to preach about?" "Oh," was the ready reply, "you can preach about God!" One trusts that this stereotyped reply will be enjoyed by Humanists. And yet through it all Mr. Rowe has maintained a fine sense of proportion and a delightful sense of humor. It is indeed grand to hear him take his position lightly and make fun of the hardships which lie in his path. And yet, one is heartened and inspired by his unflinching devotion to the truth as he sees it, no matter how much one may feel that the pacifist program is socially ineffective against such a menace as Hitlerism. The words of Reinhold Niebuhr have special application here:

> The conflict between man and man and nation and nation is tragic. If there are men who declare that, no matter what the consequences, they cannot bring themselves to participate in this slaughter, the Church ought to be able to say to the general community: We quite understand this scruple and we respect it. It proceeds from the conviction that the true end of man is brotherhood, and that love is the law of life. We who allow ourselves to become engaged in war need this testimony of the absolutist against us, lest we accept the warfare of the world as normative, lest we become callous to the horror of war, and lest we forget the ambiguity of our own actions and motives and the risk we run of achieving no permanent good from this momentary anarchy in which we are involved.

Thus, while affirming the value of the present conflict in defeating Fascism and laying the basis for a new world, it should be possible for us to admire the devotion and quality of life of such men as the Reverend Mr. Rowe.

ALFRED STIERNOTTE.

Chicago, Illinois.

The Right to Strike

TO UNITY:

The facts brought to light in recent months regarding labor unions and strikes merely confirm what was already known, that men or organizations that gain great power are prone to abuse it. Obviously it will become necessary to subject labor unions to increased government control as their membership and power increase. Racketeering will be fought as other crimes are fought. Jurisdictional strikes are almost certain to be subjected to compulsory arbitration. But a more menacing problem is exemplified by the recent strike of the United Mine Workers of America.

Thoughtful citizens will doubtless agree that the recent increase of $1 a day in the miners' wage was justified Coal mining is heavy, often unhealthful and dangerous, work. Of late years the work has often been intermittent. The extent of unemployment is likely to increase in future with the increased use of natural gas in homes and the substitution of water power for coal in the generation of electric energy. Obviously the miner needs some means of making his future livelihood more secure.

It is this precarious situation of the coal miner and the fear of what may lie ahead that have assisted ambitious leaders of the John L. Lewis type to gain power in a degree that may become a menace to the country's welfare. Workers can be readily persuaded that they are not receiving enough wages in view of their circumstances. This puts too great power in the hands of union leaders who may be unscrupulous in the use of their power. A prolonged strike, even in peacetimes, could disrupt the production activities of the country.

Suppose that at the expiration of the present contract period the miners are persuaded to demand a larger wage than the Mediation Board can approve. If Mr. Lewis were given full authority to act in the miners' behalf it takes no vivid imagination to see plenty of trouble ahead. In a showdown the government could take over the mines, but could it know that enough miners would return to work to keep industry going? Would this depend upon the size of the strike fund in reserve?

Apparently the majority of citizens think the right to strike must be held sacred; and this seems proper when the union is small and wages low. But if the public welfare is menaced to the extent that the government finds it necessary to take over the struck industry it is clear that the strike must be terminated, else it takes on the character of rebellion.

The fortunate thing is that strikes are not likely to be maintained against the public service. They are provoked by a sense of injustice, usually the feeling that the employer is reaping large profits and refusing to share them with the employes, or is using tactics to get rid of the union. Had it not been for these beliefs there would have been few strikes in the past year, as the working classes are strongly patriotic in times of emergency. Indeed, except for abuses inherent in our profit system there would be little incentive to the building up of great labor unions and the inauguration of wasteful strikes. These almost never develop where utilities are publicly owned.

Here seems to be the solution of our serious strike problems. To be sure, efficiency in public service is not acquired overnight. But it is acquired. We hear no impressive demand for turning our present public services back to private ownership. There is a growing number of able men who would rather serve their fellow men in public service than to lend their talents in the service of profiteers. There is no brighter sign than this of coming better days.

F. S. KINDER.

Denver, Colorado.